

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 15-16, and 33-36 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 15, 33, and 34 being independent. Claims 1, 4-9, and 15-16 have been amended, claims 2-3, and 10-32 have been cancelled, and claims 33-36 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found at, for example, pages 5-9 of the specification. No new matter has been introduced.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 1-10 to clarify that the methods are computer-implemented, and therefore represent statutory classes of eligible subject matter. Claims 10-16 have been cancelled, thus rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 Rejections

Claims 1-16 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action notes that claims 1-16 are rejected because “they lack structure” and claim 27 was rejected because “it is not clear the limitation if the indicated source is determined to not be a trusted source.” Claims 1-10 have been amended to now recite a computer-implemented method and claims 11-16 have been cancelled. The Office Action also noted that claims 1 and 17 lacked antecedent basis for “the advertiser source.” Applicants note that this limitation has been amended and that these claims now recite “advertiser.” Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodman (US Patent Publication No. 2005/00221649). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the amendments to the claims.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites, *inter alia*, a computer-implemented method of reviewing advertisements. In response to determining that the advertiser is a trusted

advertiser, the advertisements in the set of advertisements is submitted for review using an automated review process, where the automated review process automatically approves or disapproves an advertisement based on the content of the advertisement. A trust score for the advertiser is determined using information based on the manual review of the subset of advertisements. If the trust score is greater than or equal to a threshold trust score, the advertisements in the set of advertisements not in the selected subset is submitted for review using the automated review process. Approved advertisements of the set that are not in the subset automatically are allowed to be served if the trust score indicates that the advertiser is a trusted advertiser.

Goodman teaches a system for detecting and eliminating spam by identifying spam senders. [0057]. An Internet Service Provider monitors outgoing messages from its senders by scoring the messages based in part on the messages content. [Id.]. The total scores for a sender can be cumulated, and if the cumulated score exceeds a threshold, further action may be taken to determine if the sender is a spammer. [Id.]. For example, Goodman indicates that the sender may be challenged with a security question before permitting the user to send additional electronic mail messages. [0058].

Applicants respectively submit that because Goodman is directed towards the transmission of outbound electronic mail messages and identifying suspicious accounts responsible for said spam-sending behavior, and is not directed to placement of advertisements, Goodman necessarily fails to describe limitations that recite operations involving advertisements. Goodman therefore fails to teach or suggest "determining a trust score for the advertiser using information based on the manual review of the subset of advertisements ... if the trust score is greater than or equal to a threshold trust score: [then] submitting the advertisements in the set of advertisements not in the selected subset for review using the automated review process ... and automatically allowing approved advertisements of the set that are not in the subset to be served if the trust score indicates that the advertiser is a trusted advertiser," as required by amended independent claim 1. New claims 33 and 34 include similar limitations and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons. Claim 15 has been amended and now recites, "pulling from circulation at least one ad in a second ad group received from the trusted advertiser if the trust score indicates that the trusted advertiser is no longer a trusted advertiser." Although this

limitation is different from the limitation that is recited in claim 1, claim 15 is believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectively withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.


Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The \$1,110 Extension of Time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. No other fees are believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing attorney docket no. 16113-0769001/GP-241—00-US. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/29/2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas A. Rozyłowicz  
Reg. No. 50,620

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
P.O. Box 1022  
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1022  
Telephone: (202) 626-6395  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945